

KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)
 United States Attorney

EUMI L. CHOI (WVBN 0722)
 Chief, Criminal Division

NAHLA RAJAN (CSBN 218838)
 Special Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
 San Francisco, California 94102-3495
 Telephone: (415) 436-6838
 FAX: (415) 436-7234

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	CR06-0036 MAG
)	No. 3-05-71017-EDL
Plaintiff,)	
)	[PROPOSED] ORDER AND
v.)	STIPULATION EXCLUDING TIME
)	UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
TECK CHUEE LIM,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

The parties stipulate and agree, and the Court finds and holds, as follows:

1. The parties initially appeared on the instant matter December 29, 2005 for defendant's initial appearance on the complaint, and thereafter appeared on January 9, 2006 for defendant's detention hearing. On January 9, 2006, the matter was continued until January 13, 2006 for arraignment/preliminary hearing.

2. On January 13, 2006, the matter was continued to January 18, 2006 for arraignment before the Honorable Joseph C. Spero.

3. On January 13, 2006, Assistant Public Defender Elizabeth Falk, who currently represents the defendant, requested an exclusion of time from January 13, 2006 to January 18, 2006, based on effective preparation and continuity of counsel. The defendant agreed to an extension of time for the preliminary hearing under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1(d)

1 and an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act. The parties are involved in discussions
 2 which appear likely to lead to pre-indictment resolution of this case. Therefore, the parties are
 3 requesting an extension of time under Rule 5.1(d) and an exclusion of time under the Speedy
 4 Trial Act. The parties agree that the time from January 13, 2006 through January 18, 2006
 5 should be extended under Rule 5.1(d) and excluded in computing the time within which an
 6 information or indictment must be filed. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

7 4. In light of the foregoing facts, the failure to grant the requested exclusion would
 8 unreasonably deny counsel for the defense the reasonable time necessary for effective
 9 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See id. The ends of justice would
 10 be served by the Court excluding the proposed time period. These ends outweigh the best
 11 interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See id. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

12 5. For the reasons stated, the time period from January 13, 2006 through January 18,
 13 2006 is extended under Rule 5.1(d) and excluded from the calculation of time under the Speedy
 14 Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

15 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

16
 17 DATED: January 18, 2006

Respectfully Submitted,

18
 19 /S/
 NAHLA RAJAN
 Special Assistant United States Attorney

20
 21 DATED: January 18, 2006

/S/
 22 ELIZABETH FALK
 Counsel for Lim Teck Chuee

23
 24 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

25
 26 DATED: January 19, 2006


 27 HONORABLE JOSEPH C. SPERO
 United States Magistrate Judge